DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 697 CE 065 187

AUTHOR Gregory, Vikki L.
TITLE ET: Employment and Training Activities Serving Predominantly Low-Income Residents of Washington, D.C., with Limited Employment Qualifications.
INSTITUTION Greater Washington Research Center, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 72p.
AVAILABLE FROM Committee on Strategies to Reduce Chronic Poverty, 1129 20th Street, N.W., Suite 204, Washington, DC 20036 ($12.50, students $6.25).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Education; *Economically Disadvantaged; *Employment Qualifications; *Employment Services; *Financial Support; Job Placement; Job Search Methods; *Job Training; Low Income Groups; Poverty; *Unskilled Workers
IDENTIFIERS *District of Columbia

ABSTRACT

To assess the scope of local employment and training (ET) activities as part of citywide efforts to reduce poverty, a project measured the current state of employment and training services in the District of Columbia. Interviews with local officials provided budget totals and information about the range of ET activities available to low-income District residents; ET programs were inventoried and recent data were extracted for analysis. Findings indicated that, in 1986, nearly $68 million was spent on ET services predominantly for low-income DC residents. The funds originated from six federal departments, two Congressional appropriations, City Council and District government agency reallocations, and foundations and private employers. The monies bought three general categories of services: skills development, job search, and support services. Three groups of providers of ET services were official, educational, and special needs sectors. ET funds were often targeted; federal funds were especially likely to be strict in their restrictions or requirements. Five occupational areas predominated in ET training programs: clerk typist, other clerical, kitchen helper, custodian, and housekeeper. Fewer than two-thirds of all participants who enrolled in the inventory programs successfully completed them. About 86 percent of program completers were placed in jobs. (Appendixes include the methodology, selected ET programs, and program list.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ET:

Employment and Training Activities Serving Predominantly Low-Income Residents of Washington, D.C., with Limited Employment Qualifications

By Vikki L. Gregory
1988

Greater Washington Research Center

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C C Marshall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ET:

Employment and Training Activities Serving Predominantly Low-Income Residents of Washington, D.C., with Limited Employment Qualifications

By Vikki L. Gregory
1988

Greater Washington Research Center

The Greater Washington Research Center is an independent and non-partisan organization that provides information about the people, economy, and governance of the Washington area. It monitors trends, analyzes issues, attempts to anticipate approaching problems, and suggests options for public policy and civic action.

The work of the Research Center is supported by over 180 member companies located throughout the metropolitan area and supplemented by foundation grants.

For additional information on the Research Center and its programs, call (202) 387-0900.

Interpretations and conclusions contained in the Research Center's publications are those of the authors. They should not be ascribed to the Research Center, its trustees, its members, or its funding sources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gregory, Vikki L.
ET : employment and training activities serving predominantly low-income residents of Washington, D.C. with limited employment qualifications.

Bibliography: p.
1. Occupational training--Washington (D.C.)
2. Employment agencies--Washington (D.C.)
3. Unemployed--Services for--Washington (D.C.)
I. Title
HD5715.4.W3G74 1988 331.12'8 88-4850

Copyright© 1988 Greater Washington Research Center
Washington, D.C.
Price: $12.50 (Student price: $6.25)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
PREFACE	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II. DESCRIPTION AND DEFINITIONS	3
Description of the study	3
The research questions	3
Activities included in the study	3
The wide dispersion of employment and training activities	3
Methodology	4
Definition of terms	5
III. HISTORY OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING (ET) AND OVERVIEW OF CURRENT EFFORTS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL	6
Public sector ET	6
History	6
Current public sector approaches and programs	6
Private sector ET	9
IV. ANALYSIS OF FUNDING FOR DISTRICT ET PROGRAMS	11
Summary of ET funding in the District	11
Public sector ET for low-income District residents: agency interviews	13
Overview of ET programs administered by the D.C. government	13
Administration of District ET services	14
Joint ventures among agencies	16
Summary descriptions of agency activities	19
The Department of Employment Services (DOES)	19
The District of Columbia Public Schools	22
The Department of Housing and Community Development	23
The Department of Corrections	23
The Department of Human Services	23
The United Planning Organization	23
Groups served by ET funds	24
Support services for ET participants	26
The nature and importance of support services	26
Child care	26
Transportation	27
Making the transition to employment	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Private sector ET: an overview	28
Activities of private employers	28
Activities of other private sector groups	29
V. RESULTS OF AN INVENTORY OF ET SERVING DISTRICT RESIDENTS	30
Methodology and summary	30
Agencies providing ET	30
Participation in ET programs in the District	31
Characteristics of program participants	32
Basic skills of program participants	32
Types of ET activities	34
ET occupational areas	34
The results of participation in ET	35
ET costs	36
Support services	37
VI. FINDINGS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS	39
APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGY	45
APPENDIX B: SELECTED ET PROGRAMS IN THE DISTRICT WITH TARGET POPULATIONS	48
APPENDIX C: PROGRAM INVENTORY LIST	53
LIST OF REFERENCES	56

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
4-1	Funds allocated for employment and training serving local residents for 12 months ending in 1986	11
4-2	Funds allocated or reallocated for District-based employment and training activities for 12 months ending in 1986	12
4-3	Funds received for employment and training activities for 12 months ending in 1986	15
4-4	Funds available for disbursement by cluster after transfers	17
4-5	Funds allocated by public District agencies and private agencies to provide employment and training services for 12 months ending in 1986	18
4-6	DOES allocations for employment and training activities serving predominantly District residents for 12 months ending in 1986	21
4-7	Target populations served by federal funds for 12 months ending in 1986	25
4-8	Target populations served by DC government funds for 12 months ending in 1986	25
5-1	Cost per slot for the five most common job titles	37
5-2	Training slots providing child-care assistance in the six largest occupational categories	38

PREFACE

This report describes employment and training activities serving predominantly low-income residents of the District of Columbia during a 14-month period ending in 1986. It was prepared for the information of people trying to reduce the numbers of Washington, D.C., residents in long-term poverty by increasing their earnings from employment.

Using information gathered through interviews with public and private agency officials and through a survey of service programs, the report shows that in 1986 the federal and District governments and the private sector together allocated nearly $68 million for employment and training (ET) of predominantly low-income city residents. The author identifies some of the problems confronting individuals seeking ET and some of the problems confronting public and private agencies that provide ET services.

It is important to understand that the study is based on 1986 data. Its description of the overall flow of training funds, of types of ET activities, and of important issues generally holds true in 1988. However, some of the specifics have changed in the intervening time period. Since the study was completed, the Department of Employment Services (DOES) has planned or initiated a number of reforms and innovations to address the needs of low-income District residents. The Department's new initiatives fall into three broad areas: (1) to target services to those individuals who most need them; (2) to expand services and monitoring necessary to increase program completion and transition into the paid labor force; and (3) to provide additional training services to help the working poor upgrade their skills and earn their way out of poverty.

This paper was made possible by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.

The interpretation and conclusions in this paper are those of the author. They should not be ascribed to the Greater Washington Research Center, its trustees, its members, or its funding sources.

Joan Paddock Maxwell
Senior Associate

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the following persons for their time and patience in providing the information which made this report possible.

In the D.C. Department of Employment Services, F. Alexis H. Roberson, Director, Mary Ann Miller, Alease Taylor, Charlie Long, Dick Groner, Floyd Goff, Salina Tabron, Wendell Russell, Ian Pearis, Doris Wood, Susan Gilbert, Ed Gravely, Neal Parker, Terry Westin, Judy Cohall, John Adams, Pamela Graham, Donald Bateman, and Carolyn Jones.

In the D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development, Madeline Petty, former Director, Dorothy Cherry, Bob King, Jo Fisher-Hall, and Cathy Epps.

In the Mayor's Coordinating Council on Self-Sufficiency, Joan Jones, Dorothy Hawkins, and Barbara Kamara.

In the D.C. Department of Corrections, Hallen Williams, Bob Delmore, and Diane Lawson.

In the D.C. Department of Human Services, Audrey Rowe, Donna Pavetti, Phyllis Bolden, Ruth Royall-Hill, and Shari Curtis.

In the D.C. Public Schools, R. David Hall, former President of the Board, Otho Jones, Jean Greene, Jim Gines, Howard M. Brown, David Huie, Christine Bialek, and Leon Gray.

In the Office of Economic Development, Carol B. Thompson, former Deputy Mayor, Curtis McClinton, former Deputy Mayor, and Marie Bowman.

In the D.C. Office of Policy and Planning, Ed Myers and Debbie Maiese.

In the D.C. Office on Aging, Courtney Williams.

In the D.C. Private Industry Council, Mike Gilbert, Executive Director, and Lorraine Whipple.

At the Greater Washington Board of Trade, John Tydings, Executive Director, and Lori Seader.

In the Office of the City Administrator, Thomas Downs, former Deputy Mayor for Operations, and Brenda Kelly.

And Sam Newman, Julie Rogers, Irene Lee, Demetra Nightingale, Lynn Burbridge, Jim Kutz, Lucy Dayton, Diane Flanagan-Montgomery, Myles Maxfield, Jannie John, Katie Johnson, Peter Edelman, Marc Bendick, Glenn

Ihrig, the Greater Washington Research Center family, especially Joan Maxwell, Bob Peterson, Carol Horne, Joyce Y. Williams, and Elise Levin, and the members of the Service Providers' Professional Exchange.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Employment and training (ET) services are one of the most important tools available in any effort to reduce long-term poverty. Nationwide, ET programs try to move people out of poverty through training for employment and improving employment opportunities for the working poor.

In an effort to assess the scope of local employment and training activities as part of citywide efforts to reduce poverty, this project set out to measure the current state of ET in the District of Columbia. Extensive interviews with local officials provided budget totals and information about the range of ET activities available to low-income District residents. We also inventoried ET programs and extracted recent data for analysis.

This paper considers the following questions:

1. What ET services are available to low-income, low-skilled District residents?
2. How many residents participate in these services?
3. What are the results of their participation?
4. What do the services cost?

First, the numbers are large. In 1986, nearly $68 million was spent on ET services predominantly for low-income District residents. The funds originated from six federal departments, two Congressional appropriations, the D.C. City Council and District government agency reallocations, as well as several foundations and private employers.

The monies buy a wide range of services, from remedial education to job placement. These services can be grouped into three general categories: the skills-development category, the job-search category, and the support services category. The providers of ET services can also be grouped into three general categories: the official sector (agencies mandated to provide ET), the educational sector (mostly schools), and the special needs sector (organizations that provide ET as an adjunct to providing other services to certain special groups). The official sector accounts for almost 83 percent of government ET monies; the educational, for nearly 8 percent; and the special needs, for 10 percent. Into these

three sectors fall myriad actual service providers, private and public, small and large, for-profit and nonprofit.

ET funds are often targeted, that is, aimed specifically at a certain group or groups; federal funds are especially likely to be strict in their restrictions or requirements. Federal funds are also likely to have particularly stiff performance requirements (high placement standards or low cost-per-participant levels). Local funds are often more flexible. This suggests that coordination between local and federal programs could allow for more effective use of all ET funds.

ET training programs tend to fall into certain occupational areas more often than others. Of eleven broad occupational areas that the official ET sector covers, the five that dominated our survey are clerk typist, other clerical, kitchen helper, custodian, and housekeeper.

Fewer than two-thirds (63%) of all participants who enrolled in the inventory programs succcessfully completed them. Of program completers, about 86% were placed in jobs. However, in all, only 47% of the participants who enrolled in these programs were able to successfully complete the program and find a job.

Because of the complexity of ET funding and the diversity of the resultant programs, ET efforts present a challenge for planning. As more specific data become available on all aspects of ET, more sophisticated answers to now unanswerable questions will be within reach.

II. DESCRIPTION AND DEFINITIONS

Description of the Study

The research questions

This study was designed as part of a broader effort to investigate ways to increase the earnings of District residents who are at risk of living in long-term poverty. Its charge was to answer four interrelated questions:

1. What employment and training services are available to low-income, low-skilled District residents?
2. How many residents participate in these services?
3. What are the results of their participation?
4. What do the services cost?

Activities included in the study

For purposes of this study, employment and training activities were defined as those services that have as a primary goal the permanent paid employment of program participants. Included in these are not only training and employment assistance programs but also support services (such as child care, medical care, and housing) whose goal is to facilitate participants' employment. Programs excluding low-income, low-skilled District residents were not included.

We focused on low-income, low-skilled people because they are at greatly increased risk of living in long-term poverty. We defined low income as below the federal poverty level. We defined low skilled as not possessing a high school diploma and equivalent reading and arithmetic skills. However, we cannot be sure that program operators who reported low-income and low-skilled participants were always using identical definitions.

The wide dispersion of employment and training activities

Employment and training activities serving low-income people can be grouped into three categories.

Official ET programs are administered by a public agency in carrying out an official mandate to provide employment and training services to low-income people.

Educational ET programs have employment and training attributes but are administered by the educational system as part of an educational process. As a general distinction, official ET is focused on acquiring a job, while educational ET is focused on acquiring skills. Job-holding is assumed to be a possible outcome of educational ET but is not a formal goal. The distinction between the two is often blurred. For example, the educational system might operate a training program that appears identical to one in the official ET cluster. However, if the educational ET program does not provide formal help getting a job after the training, we categorize it as educational rather than official.

Finally, special needs ET is provided by agencies in the course of meeting some other human service objective. An example would be a program funded by a public housing agency to train residents to perform services in public housing projects.

Because of the wide dispersion of employment and training, it is difficult to measure the full extent of specific activities in each of the three categories.

Methodology

We relied on two principal sources:

1. interviews with spokespersons for public agencies in the District of Columbia; and
2. a telephone survey of all public and private employment and training programs we identified that met our criteria.

The study has taken some fifteen months to complete. Interviews have been held with approximately 39 spokespersons for 8 local government agencies; 112 programs were included.

No central source tracks or reports on all employment and training activities. Identifying funding sources and eligible programs proved difficult.

Also, the records maintained by agencies and programs varied significantly. The required levels of recorded detail were set by the funding source. In both public and private programs recordkeeping requirements

were sometimes nonexistent (except those in the official ET sector). Thus, it was often impossible for agency spokespersons and program operators to answer our four research questions. Double counting, or the counting of program participants by more than one agency or agency sub-part, proved a nearly insurmountable problem. For example, often the same program participants were counted by several funding or monitoring agencies, making it difficult to provide disaggregated enrollments. Similarly, it was frequently difficult to separate employment and training expenses from other agency or company expenses. Out of the 112 programs participating in our survey, 79 gave us complete cost information.

Details of the study methodology may be found in Appendix A.

Definition of Terms

Basic education -- increasing basic reading, comprehension, and computation skills. Basic education can also include English as a second language.

Job counseling -- helping a person identify his or her marketable skills, decide on potential career paths, and find appropriate entry-level jobs.

Job search assistance -- helping with resume-writing, job-hunting, effective interviewing, and sometimes providing listings of available jobs.

Occupational or specific skills training -- skills training associated with a particular occupation. This training can be given in the classroom, on the job, or in combination.

On-the-job training -- training at the workplace. The worker's salary is subsidized at least in part by public funds. At the end of the training period it is hoped that the employer will hire the trainee as a regular worker.

Support services -- a variety of activities that, while not directly job-focused, help people complete their training and make the transition to full-time employment. These can include child care, transportation, psychological counseling, emergency housing, food and clothing, and legal assistance.

Work experience -- working in a temporary, publicly subsidized job. This is a way to provide employment history for low-skilled people who have not worked. Permanent employment in such placements is not expected.

III. HISTORY OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING (ET) AND OVERVIEW OF CURRENT EFFORTS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

Public Sector ET

History

Since the creation of the Works Progress Administration in 1935, the public sector has borne the responsibility for moving low-income people into the economic mainstream. As the economy has fluctuated, so too has the emphasis shifted between the cyclically unemployed and the structurally (or chronically) unemployed. From the WPA job creation strategy through the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) in 1962, public employment and training concentrated on dislocated workers: those who lost jobs because of technological change or industry decline. Beginning in the late 1960s, public resources were aimed at those who remained locked out even in the best economic times: the chronically unemployed. With the 1970-71 recession, the public system again shifted its emphasis to accommodate the needs of dislocated workers; however, programs for the chronically unemployed remained. Though current policy emphasizes programming for the disadvantaged or chronically unemployed, the system maintains a dual focus.

Current public sector approaches and programs

Currently, the federal government uses four strategies to move people into jobs: (1) occupational training; (2) direct job placement; (3) job creation; and (4) employer incentives.

The two lead programs at the federal level for providing occupational training to move chronically and cyclically unemployed persons into paid work are the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and the Perkins Vocational Education Act (Perkins). JTPA was passed by Congress in 1982 to involve private employers more in designing and delivering employment and training. One hundred percent federally funded, JTPA focuses on the economically disadvantaged and on dislocated workers; would-be participants must meet certain income criteria.

Perkins, passed in 1985, attempted to stimulate improved and flexible vocational education for disadvantaged groups. Vocational education is widely dispersed, involving 16,000 institutions and over 17 million students.[1] Low income is not a criterion for participation in Perkins-funded activities. Through JTPA and Perkins, the federal government spends a total of about $8 billion per year to support occupational training.

The key component of the federal direct job placement strategy is the Employment Service (ES), established by the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933. The ES is a federally financed, state-run program designed to match job-seekers with employers. Between 1933 and 1983 the Employment Service reports it has counseled 33 million people in job-seeking skills and techniques, conducted 40 million aptitude tests, and filled 126 million job openings. The ES maintains job listings by occupation. Job-seekers who come to ES offices are classified according to occupation and then shown appropriate job listings, which are provided voluntarily by employers. Listings in other media, such as the local newspaper, are not included in the ES directory. Other services provided by the ES vary widely by state. Other common services include technical assistance to employers on personnel matters (e.g., job restructuring, turnover, and absentee rates) and labor market information, including area labor supply and wage level data.

For the last two decades, the effectiveness of the ES in carrying out its mission has come under question. A 1982 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report found that, while some states are doing better than others, fewer than 25 percent of all ES registrants are eventually placed into jobs by the ES.

In addition to job listings, the ES also provides other services designed to help job-seekers find work. These include counseling, testing, and referrals to education and training. However, the CBO report stated that few ES registrants received these services. Overall, seven percent of ES job-seekers received counseling, three percent were tested, and fewer than two percent were referred to training. The report also questioned the ability of the ES to help people secure long-term economic

---

[1]It is not unusual for students not to recognize they are in a vocational institution.

self-sufficiency; nearly 40 percent of the ES job listings were short term, lasting no more than 150 days and, of the short-term jobs, the majority actually lasted no more than three days.

In June 1987, the U.S. Department of Labor published the results of public comments on the role and need for the ES. Significantly, over 97% of the respondents agreed that a public labor exchange will be needed in the labor market of the future, though many advocated streamlining or refocusing the current system. Another important outcome of the comments centered on the appropriate role of ES. There were two primary views: the majority (63%) said that coordination must be enhanced to eliminate duplications, gaps, and inconsistencies between and among ES, unemployment insurance, job training, and the various agencies administering support services. A minority (25%) supported full "one-stop-shopping" by integration of related services.

The Emergency Jobs Appropriations Act of 1983 was the most recent federal experience in mass job creation. Its primary objective was to provide relief from the high unemployment of the 1981-82 recession. Congress intended that the funds be obligated and disbursed as rapidly as possible; in fact, however, funds were not authorized until after the recession ended and were spent slowly. By June 1985, over two years after the Act was passed, about half of the funds were still unspent. The Emergency Jobs Act was like other public works job-creation initiatives; it was slow in passing and slow in spending.

One direction federal programs have recently taken is special targeting. For example, the Work Incentive Program (WIN) targets AFDC recipients and provides ET opportunities for this group. More recently, Congress has also targeted Food Stamp recipients for special attention by local governments.

The theory behind employer incentives is for an employer to hire targeted individuals at a subsidy and then keep the employee on. The federal government authorized the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit (TJTC) to encourage employers to hire from special disadvantaged groups.[2] Other wage subsidies

---

[2]Authorization and funding of TJTC at the federal level lapsed in FY87. The program was reauthorized in 1987 under the Tax Reform Act of 1986. Information from states to IRS was nearly nonexistent in FY87.

such as on-the-job training authorized under JTPA encourage employers to hire the disadvantaged and make an investment in their training. Affirmative action and contract compliance regulations have also been used to stimulate employer hiring of the disadvantaged.

The use of block grants, declining federal support, and a federal "hands off" approach to program monitoring and oversight have all led to increased state and local control over employment and training. Recently, several states have brought together state and federal human resource funds to design and implement extensive education, placement, and ET programs aimed particularly at welfare recipients.

Along with the shift from federal to state responsibility, a philosophical shift has reshaped the public ET system. This shift involves redesignating the ET "customer" from those in need of employment to those in need of trained workers. This shift parallels the expanded, more institutionalized role of private employers in the design and delivery of ET services. The shift also coincides with a circumscribed role for private nonprofit organizations. Although these organizations continue to provide a significant share of publicly funded ET services, their role is limited. In fact, when the term "private sector" is used today it is often understood to include only private for-profit employers.

As a result, each state, and often each local jurisdiction, must produce its own unique ET system. Although state and local governments have been forced to increase their investment and participation, this has not often led to better, more coordinated use of funds.

Private Sector ET

According to the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), private employers invest over $30 billion each year in employee training. According to ASTD, this is mostly upgrade training. However, many private employers also are providing their employees with simple literacy training. A 1982 survey of corporate employers by the Center for Public Resources found that 75 percent of the corporations surveyed provided remedial skills programs for employees. AT&T in 1985 reported spending $6 million annually in basic reading, writing, and math training for its employees. Polaroid Corporation provides similar services each year to between 500 and 750 employees. Information about these and other large companies shows a trend

among private employers to provide upgrade and other training for employees at all levels.

For-profit and nonprofit employers who train currently unemployable people most often work in partnership with the public sector. By using employer incentives or by serving in an advisory role for training programs, these employers invest in pre-employment training. And, of course, they serve as job sources for those who complete training.

The for-profit and nonprofit sectors also have other actors involved in ET. Unions, churches, community-based organizations, occupational and industry associations all participate in the design and delivery of services. Union- and employer-sponsored career orientation, outreach, and apprenticeship programs are common. These efforts are difficult to track in terms of the employees served, the training provided, the cost of services, or program effectiveness.

IV. ANALYSIS OF FUNDING FOR DISTRICT ET PROGRAMS

Summary of ET Funding in the District

Nearly $68 million[3] was spent by the District's public and private sectors combined during twelve months ending in 1986[4] to provide ET services to Washingtonians, the majority of whom were low-income District residents. More than $32 million of these funds came from federal programs; $34 million was appropriated by the District government; and $1 million came from private sector sources (see Table 4-1).

Table 4-1
Funds allocated for employment and training serving local residents for 12 months ending in 1986

Source	Amount
Federal Government	$32,413,004
DC Government	34,228,000
Foundations and Private Employers	1,199,375
Total funds all sources	$67,840,379

These funds came from six federal departments, two special Congressional appropriations, the District government, foundations, and private employers (see Table 4-2).

[3]This figure was obtained by adding all ET expenses identified by the study. No estimate was included of the additional cost of salaries of direct employment by public agencies of low-income individuals, the unsubsidized costs of on-the-job training to private sector employers who participated in the OJT program, publicly subsidized child care during training, or publicly subsidized transportation related to job placement of low-income residents. It should be noted that some $3.6 million of these funds were carried forward from PY84 Federal grants to DOES.

[4] The major federal ET program, JTPA, operates and reports program outcomes on a Program Year that runs from July through June, while other federal and local programs operate and report program outcomes on a Fiscal Year that runs from October through September. Thus, the time period used for this study is Program Year 1985 (July 1, 1985 through June 30, 1986) and Fiscal Year 1986 (October 1, 1985 through September 30, 1986). Still other agencies use the calendar year as their accounting period.

Table 4-2
Funds allocated or reallocated for District-based employment and training activities for 12 months ending in 1986

Source of funds	Amount awarded or reallocated	Local recipient
Federal Government		
Department of Labor	$28,821,235	DC Government
	488,662	Private Agency
Subtotal Dept. Labor	$29,309,897	
Congress		
(Specter Amendment)	$ *	DC Government
(Emergency Jobs)	NA**	DC Government
Department of Education	$ 684,107	DC Government
	127,000	Private Agency
Subtotal Dept. Ed.	$ 811,107	
Department of Housing & Urban Development	$ 410,000	DC Government
Department of Health and Human Services	$ 1,300,000	DC Government
	110,000	Private Agency
Subtotal HHS	$ 1,410,000	
Department of Defense	NA+	Private Agency
Department of Transportation	NA+	Private Agency
Various Federal Agencies	472,000	Private Agency++
Subtotal Fed. Funds	$32,413,004	
District of Columbia		
DC City Council	$30,611,000	DC Government Agencies
Unspecified/DC Government+++	3,617,000	DC Government
Subtotal District Funds	$34,228,000	
Private sources		
Foundations	$ 657,483	Private Agencies
Private Employers	541,892	Private Agencies & Private Employers
Subtotal Private Funds	$ 1,199,375	
Total funds all sources	$67,840,379	

*Congress made a lump sum appropriation of $22.3 million in FY83 under the Specter Amendment to enable the DC Government to make educational and ET services available to prisoners in DC correctional facilities. This was a one-time appropriation; no time limit was set by which funds must be expended. It was not possible to disaggregate the amount expended in FY86 under this appropriation; thus no amount is shown.

**The District government received $33.4 million from 19 federal agencies under the Emergency Jobs Act of 1983. The money was disbursed through several agencies and the ways in which an agency could use its funds varied widely. No time limits were set by which the funds must be expended. Unknown amounts were spent by DC public agencies in FY86 to fund ET.

+Recipient agency identified funding source but would not release the amount.

++Recipients stated that funding was national but did not release funding source.

+++These funds represent subcontracts from DC government agencies to local private nonprofit agencies to provide ET services. While we can trace the source of these funds to the contracting DC government agency, we were unable to identify the original agency source of these funds; thus, we identify them separately. The amount shown includes funds from Public Schools, Human Services, and various other DC Government agencies.

The rest of this chapter describes (1) ET services provided by District public agencies; (2) an overview of private-sector ET; and (3) the results of an inventory conducted for this study of 112 specific ET programs serving predominantly low-income District residents.

Public Sector ET for Low-income District Residents: Agency Interviews

Overview of ET programs administered by the D.C. government

The D.C. government manages a wide range of federally and locally funded programs designed to help applicants get jobs. Employment programs train participants in basic and occupational skills and provide job placement services. Related programs offer transportation, child care, and other support services to help participants complete their training programs and get jobs. The city also has a number of initiatives aimed at encouraging employers to hire local residents. These initiatives include first-source agreements, job pledges, and salary reimbursements. Often, programs

directed at employers and programs directed at participants operate in tandem to increase their effectiveness.

Administration of District ET Services

In 1986 six District agencies administered the bulk of federal and District-appropriated funds for ET. The six agencies fit into three categories: (1) official ET agencies, or those officially charged with providing ET services; (2) educational ET agencies, or those that provide educational programs designed to teach job-related skills; and (3) special needs ET agencies, or those that provide ET services as part of meeting other human service needs.

The D.C. Department of Employment Services (DOES) alone occupies the first category; it is the City's official ET agency. The second category consists of the District's Public Schools (Public Schools), which administers adult and vocational education programs. The third category consists of four city agencies with various mandates: the Department of Human Services, the Department of Housing and Community Development, the Department of Corrections, and the United Planning Organization (UPO).[5]

The bulk of ET funds received by public agencies in the District went to DOES. DOES received nearly $55 million, almost $29 million of which came from the federal government and just under $26 million came from the District government. Next were the Public Schools, with nearly $5 million in funds, most of which came from the District. Third was the Department of Human Services, which received roughly $2.3 million. Again, nearly all these funds came from the District government. Housing, with slightly over $1 million, UPO, with $1 million, and Corrections made up the rest. Private agencies and employers received over $2.3 million directly (see Table 4-3). However, as will be discussed later, expenditures to provide direct ET services were divided quite differently.

---

[5]Although the United Planning Organization is being included here along with other city agencies, it is in fact a quasi-public agency. Since 1964 it has served as the District's designated community action agency, and as such is the recipient of federal social service block grants.

Table 4-3
Funds received for employment and training activities for 12 months ending in 1986

Agency	Funds received	Source
DC Government agency		
DOES	$28,821,235	Federal Government
	25,761,000	DC Government
Subtotal	$54,582,235	
Public Schools	684,107	Federal Government
	4,100,000	DC Government
	121,000	Unspecified/DC Government*
Subtotal	$ 4,905,107	
Housing	410,000	Federal Government
	750,000+	DC Government
Subtotal	$ 1,160,000	
Corrections	?	Federal Government
UPO	1,000,000++	Federal Government
Human Services	300,000	Federal Government
	2,019,000	Unspecified/DC Government*
Subtotal	$ 2,319,000	
DC Government agencies	$ 1,477,000	Unspecified*
Subtotal	$65,443,342	
Private agencies and employers		
Private agencies	1,197,662	Federal Government
Private agencies	541,892+++	Private Employers
and employers	657,483+++	Foundations
Subtotal	$ 2,397,037	
TOTAL	$67,840,379	

*These funds represent subcontracts from DC government agencies to local private nonprofit agencies to provide ET services. While we can trace the source of these funds to the contracting DC government agency, we were unable to identify the original agency source.

+Another $780,000 was identified in a report by the Mayor's Coordinating Council on Client Self-Sufficiency as being used by Housing to provide ET services. However, we were unable to verify either the amount or source of these funds with the Housing spokesperson or with federal agencies.

++The UPO's total budget is over $14 million; it uses over $1.0 million to provide ET services locally, and uses other monies to provide services for low-income residents, including support services for ET programs. Since we are unable to disaggregate the figures to isolate only those pertaining to ET, we have included just the $1 million.

+++We are unable to disaggregate these funds to show which are received by private agencies and which are received by private employers.

Joint Ventures among Agencies

Along with designing, implementing, and administering its own programs, each agency cooperates with other agencies on some efforts. Joint ventures are particularly common between DOES and each of the other five agencies; DOES often subcontracts for programs. Because each agency in a joint venture reports on the program, it is difficult to avoid duplication or double counting. For this study, we erred on the side of undercounting. When joint venture programs were identified and agencies could not assure an unduplicated count, we counted the participants reported by only one agency (though each agency's dollar contribution was counted). Despite this precaution, duplicate counts might still exist since, in some multi-agency programs, the agency official providing information might not have been aware of the involvement of another agency.

Emblematic of cooperative efforts is the transfer of funds from DOES to the D.C. Private Industry Council (PIC). Through a cooperative agreement, DOES administers federal ET funds and transfers amounts needed by the PIC to subcontract with local agencies providing ET services. This agreement has been expanded to include ET funds appropriated by the D.C. government. In 1986 the PIC received nearly $1.5 million for ET from DOES.

After all transfers, the funds available for disbursement to public and private agencies for service delivery were just under $64 million in the public sector and over $3.8 million in the private sector. Excluding the $2.4 million allocated by the private sector (the $1.5 million allocated by the PIC is classified as official sector), at $53 million the official cluster constituted almost 83 percent of the District government's ET activities. The educational cluster, at just under $5 million, accounted for nearly 8 percent. The special needs cluster accounted for 10 percent (see Tables 4-4 and 4-5).

Table 4-4
Funds available for disbursement by cluster after transfers

Source	Amount
Public sector	
Official cluster	$53,089,235
Educational cluster	4,905,107
Special needs cluster	5,956,000
Subtotal	$63,950,342
Private sector	3,890,037
Total	$67,840,379

Table 4-5
Funds allocated by public District agencies and private agencies to provide employment and training services for 12 months ending in 1986

Spending agency	Funds	Source
DC Government		
DOES	$27,896,235	Federal Government
	25,193,000	DC City Council
Subtotal	$53,089,235	
Public Schools	684,107	Federal Government
	4,100,000	DC City Council
	121,000	Unspecified/DC Government*
Subtotal	$ 4,905,107	
Human Services	300,000	Federal Government
	2,019,000	Unspecified/DC Government*
Subtotal	$ 2,319,000	
Housing	410,000	Federal Government
	700,000	DC City Council
	50,000	Unspecified
Subtotal	$ 1,160,000	
UPO	$ 1,000,000	Federal Government
Other DC Government agencies	1,477,000	Unspecified/DC Government*
Subtotal: DC Government	$63,950,342	
Private Sector		
Private Industry Council**	1,493,000	DC Government Agency
Private agencies & private employers	1,197,662	Federal Government
	657,483	Foundations
	541,892	Private Employers
Subtotal: Private Sector	$ 3,890,037	
Grand Total	$67,840,379	

*We identified these funds as being expended for ET but were unable to identify their original source.

**The PIC is authorized under JTPA as a vehicle through which to institutionalize private employer involvement in public ET. Although operating on public funds, we identify the PIC as a private sector agency in keeping with its purpose and mandate.

Summary Descriptions of Agency Activities

The following are summary profiles of each of the six agencies' ET activities. For more detailed descriptions of agency programs, see Appendix B.

The Department of Employment Services (DOES)

DOES, with a total 1986 budget of $74.6 million, covers all aspects of employment. Its many responsibilities include finding jobs for job-seekers, providing training for D.C. residents, and paying unemployment compensation. In 1986, DOES operated through four major organizational divisions, two of which (Employment Services and Employability Development) provided training, direct job placement, assessment, certification, and referral services. (The other two divisions did not provide ET services and will not be discussed here.)

The Employment Services program (ES) was funded by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) at nearly $7 million in PY85 (excluding Unemployment Insurance funds). The ES maintains a job bank with local job listings and helps match workers with jobs. ES also processes and provides vouchers and certifications for other programs, including Targeted Jobs Tax Credit. Finally, ES maintains the casual labor office, which provides certification and immediate placement for single-day jobs. In PY85 ES reported 89,574 registrants, over 88 percent of whom were District residents. This includes those people required to register with ES in order to receive Unemployment Insurance benefits, those who are participating in other DOES programs, and employed individuals seeking new jobs.

Employability Development is the locus for most of the agency's ET activities. The Employability Development program reported services to 11,865 people (excluding approximately 25,000 summer youth participants) during FY86, using mostly local funds appropriated under the Youth Employment Act (YEA) and federal funds under JTPA.

The YEA, enacted by the District's City Council in 1979, authorizes five ET programs all operated by DOES: the Training and Retraining for Employment Program, the Adults with Dependents Program,[6] the Out-of-School

---

[6]An amendment to the Youth Employment Act was passed by the D.C. City Council in February 1987 that eliminated the requirement that individuals be responsible for dependents in order to be eligible for this program.

Year Round Employment Program, the In-School Work Experience Program, and the D.C. Summer Youth Program. Although low-income residents are targets for YEA services, other residents are not excluded. JTPA programs are more strictly limited to low-income people.

In 1986 DOES received nearly $24 million under YEA and $20 million under JTPA (see Table 4-6).

The Private Industry Council (PIC) requests and receives funds from DOES to pay for its programs. Although the PIC is publicly funded, its board of directors has a majority of private employers; the PIC will be discussed in more detail under private sector ET. (Because DOES includes the PIC's funds and programs in its reports, we include only the DOES-provided figures.)

DOES also receives direct federal contracts and subcontracts to provide ET services.

Table 4-6
DOES allocations for employment and training activities serving predominantly District residents* for 12 months ending in 1986

Program	Funds	
FEDERAL FUNDS		
JTPA Funds		
Adult AFDC	$ 8,373,651	
Summer Youth	8,075,002	
Dislocated Workers	1,057,914	
Administration	2,700,171	
Job Corps	228,456	
Subtotal:		$20,435,194
Other Federal Funds		
Employment Services	$ 6,857,150	
Work Incentive (WIN)	1,157,553	
Senior Aides	371,338	
Subtotal:		$ 8,386,041
DC GOVERNMENT FUNDS		
YEA Funds		
Summer Youth	$ 8,541,000	
Training and Retraining Employment Program	5,213,000	
Adults with Dependents	4,887,000	
Out-of-School Youth	3,407,000	
In-School Youth	1,713,000	
Subtotal:		$23,761,000
Other City Council Funds		
STEP	940,000	
Apprenticeship	544,000	
Work Incentive (WIN)	457,000	
Senior Aides	59,000	
Subtotal:		$ 2,000,000
TOTAL:		$54,582,235**

*Every program listed here is designed to serve only District residents, with the exception of Apprenticeship and Employment Services. ES serves all persons who are legally able to work, whether unemployed, under employed, or seeking a change in employment.

**This total compares with the total shown in Table 4-3 above.

The District of Columbia Public Schools

The District of Columbia Public Schools operates extensive remediation, vocational, and skills-training programs throughout the city. In FY86 the public schools received $4.9 million to provide adult basic and vocational training. The bulk of the schools' ET services are funded by local and federal educational monies, although the schools also bid for DOES and other contracts.[7]

Public Schools programs are available free or at low cost to D.C. residents without regard to income; most courses are open enrollment. Although the schools provide a variety of ET services, complete information about program enrollments, completion rates, placement, and participants is available only for DOES-funded programs. It is impossible to estimate accurately the total number of low-income, low-skilled participants in other Public Schools programs.

Adult training is provided by the schools through the Division of Career and Adult Education. Seven career centers offer over 60 occupational programs. Each program comprises one or more courses that, together, prepare the student for a specific occupation, such as diesel mechanic or nurse's aide.[8] These programs are distinguished from the rest of the city's ET activities in that they are long term; most last two years.

The schools' FY86 annual performance report showed a cumulative enrollment of 17,116 in the programs (this is <u>not</u> an unduplicated count) and 788 job placements. Because of the Division's open-entry, open-exit system, the number of participants at any one point varies tremendously. For example, a census of enrollees taken January 24, 1986 showed 7,763 program participants. Because some people participated in more than one program, an unduplicated count was impossible. In addition, participant data were not available by occupational training areas. Some career

---

[7]In fact, with more than $900,000 in subcontracts, the Public Schools constitutes DOES' largest subcontractor.

[8]Identifying the exact number of training sites can be confusing since some programs or "schools" are physically housed within other schools. For example, the D.C. Apprenticeship School is located at Phelps Career Development Center.

centers are noted for training in a particular occupational area, but a variety of programs is offered in all seven of the centers.

The Public Schools' Office of Instruction also offers training services through DOES contracts.

The Department of Housing and Community Development

The Department of Housing currently supports ET for public housing residents in two ways: (1) by hiring residents and creating jobs for them; and (2) through joint ventures with other city agencies. The agency allocated about $1.1 million for these services in FY86. Because Housing integrates ET with its other operations we do not have complete information on those served. However, the Department reports that at least 705 people received some ET assistance.

The Department of Corrections

In FY83, Congress passed a special federal law appropriating $22.3 million to enable the city to provide education, training, and vocational services to prison inmates. As an outgrowth of this legislation, Corrections' Office of Educational Services offers ET services designed to help move released prisoners into mainstream society; budget information for these services is not available.

The Department of Human Services

The over $2 million spent by DHS for ET services was focused on groups with special needs. These services were provided by three units: the Rehabilitation Services Administration, the Developmental Disabilities Council, and the Income Maintenance Administration.

Numbers served by the first two agencies are not available; the Income Maintenance Administration reported serving some 44 people in FY86, with the start-up of its new JOBS Program.

The United Planning Organization

Finally, the quasi-public United Planning Organization (UPO) has served as the District's designated community action agency since 1964. UPO operates a variety of anti-poverty programs; it provides ET and support services

through ten neighborhood centers and eight delegate agencies.[9] UPO's ET programs are funded by federal block grant funds as well as by DOES subcontracts. We have conservatively estimated $1 million as UPO's 1986 ET expenditures (excluding DOES contracts). Support services offered by UPO include crisis intervention, child care, and transportation. No estimate was possible for the cost of these services as they related to ET.

Groups Served by ET Funds

Of the $67.8 million identified by this study as allocated in 1986 for ET services predominantly for District residents, a little over one-third (approximately $23.5 million) was designated exclusively for low-income people. Another $5.2 million was directed to various groups (such as displaced homemakers) but with priority to low-income people. Of the over $29.2 million targeted exclusively or preferentially for low-income people, 77 percent was federal and 23 percent District funds. A further $0.9 million was designated for people with other special needs (such as the disabled, people with English as a second language, and parolees). While not all of the people in the special needs category were low income, many were.

Federal ET allocations strongly emphasized services for low-income people. Of the $32.4 million in federal funds received by District agencies, over $22 million (or nearly 70 percent) was targeted either exclusively for low-income people or with priority to low-income people. The balance went to services for unemployed people, people with special needs (such as prisoners), dislocated workers, and vocational education students (see Table 4-7).

Of the $34.2 million directly allocated by the District government for ET, over $6.6 million (or nearly one-fifth) was targeted exclusively or preferentially to low-income people. Almost $2.6 million was targeted to people with special needs. Of the remainder, $13.6 million was targeted to youth, and the balance, $11.3 million, was targeted partly to unemployed District residents and partly to all District residents. While these programs serve many low-income people, others also take advantage of the

---

[9]Delegate agencies are nonprofit organizations officially identified as the local recipients of federal anti-poverty monies.

Table 4-7
Target populations served by federal funds for 12 months ending in 1986

Target population	
Exclusively for low-income people	$22,291,171
Priority to low income people	324,107
Services to unemployed people	6,974,600
People with special needs	855,662
Dislocated workers	1,075,464
Vocational education	420,000
Unspecified	472,000
Total	$32,413,004

opportunities they offer. An example of such programs would be the Summer Youth Program (\$8.5 million in District funds in 1986). This popular program subsidizes paid summer jobs for young District residents, irrespective of family income (see Table 4-8).

Table 4-8
Target populations served by DC government funds for 12 months ending in 1986

Exclusively for low-income people		$ 1,786,000
Priority to low-income people		4,887,000
People with special needs		2,598,200
Youth		
In school	1,713,000	
Out of school	3,407,000	
Summer youth	8,541,000	
Subtotal		13,661,000
DC residents		
Unemployed	5,213,000	
Apprentices	544,000	
No other requirements	5,538,000	
Subtotal		$11,295,800
Total		$34,228,000

Of the federal funds targeted exclusively for low-income people, over 80 percent (\$19.2 million) were JTPA funds. This program is performance driven, with set job placement rates and minimum wage at placement

rates. Combined, these rates often force program operators to select participants who have the best chance of succeeding. A participant with complex problems -- true of many people in chronic poverty -- is likely to drive up costs per trainee and is thus less attractive to operators.

Support Services for ET Participants

The nature and importance of support services

An integral part of successful ET services is the support services that help low-income residents to participate in training. In May 1986 the Support Services Subcommittee of the Mayor's Coordinating Council on Client Self-Sufficiency published the results of a survey on support services. The Subcommittee contacted 44 local ET programs serving a total of 1,300 low-income residents and asked these providers what their clients' most critical support service needs were, both during and immediately after training. Finding and paying for child care, both during and after training, was ranked as the most significant problem. Next in importance were transportation and training or work-related expenses. Other identified needs included housing assistance, access to mental and physical health services, and care for other dependents.

The Support Services Subcommittee's survey found that these needs were met by ET providers in what it called a "crisis management" (as opposed to a systematic) approach. Nearly all ET support services were furnished through separate, publicly supported programs. Most ET providers do not provide support services. Instead, they refer their clients to public or private agencies. The District provides help through a combination of direct payments, vouchers, and direct services. A few providers, however, raise funds in the private sector to fill gaps by buying the needed support services. Some of these include help with transportation expenses and help buying tools and interview clothes. We do not know the extent of this practice.

Child care

The District government has made a commitment to provide child care for any resident who needs it in order to participate in a program leading to employment. In FY86 the City subsidized 6,500 child-care slots, serving

both ET participants and low-income working parents. The majority of the slots was allotted to preschoolers (3 to 5 years old). Since data on the number and the ages of the children of ET parents are unavailable, it is impossible to measure whether the slots are adequate to the need. The District has recently instituted an information and referral system, housed at the Washington Child Development Council, to help identify available child care. In addition, a number of District-funded ET programs train people to become child-care providers.

Transportation

The DOES Transportation Response Center was created in FY86 as part of the Mayor's Regional Employment Program. It helps residents who need transportation to get jobs in the suburbs. The Center provides limited transportation subsidies such as farecards or tokens for suburban job interviews and subsidized van service for suburban employers with at least 10 new District hires.

To help ET participants meet transportation and other training costs, some city-funded programs pay an hourly "wage" to program participants. Others provide a needs-based weekly payment; still others provide no such funds.

Making the transition to employment

So far, no institutionalized support system has been identified that helps residents make a successful transition from training into paid work. The Self-Sufficiency Subcommittee's report stated that this is a critical gap that can result in a person's failure to stay employed once he or she has been successfully trained and placed. Needed services include both counseling and assistance with initial work expenses, since a new employee often has to wait for some time before receiving his or her first paycheck. No data were available correlating work retention with the presence or absence of support services; we are unable to determine the extent or the impact of the need.

Private Sector ET: An Overview

Activities of private employers

In the District, most private-sector ET services are provided in partnership with the public system. Private, nonprofit, community-based organizations provide direct services. Their programs are overwhelmingly publicly funded. Private-sector District employers are not active in directly providing ET for people seeking entry-level jobs; but, as is true nationally, they provide upgrade training for employees.

Employers are involved with entry-level job-seekers in on-the-job training (OJT). In OJT the District reimburses an employer for some portion of a person's wages in return for worksite training opportunities (usually lasting about 12 to 16 weeks). When OJT works at its best, the employer finds that at the end of the training, the trainee has become a productive worker and the employer keeps him or her on as permanent staff. In fact, nationally there is a high correlation between enrollment in OJT and unsubsidized job placement. Under the federally administered Targeted Jobs Tax Credit (TJTC),[10] employers receive a tax credit for hiring individuals from specific target populations, including economically disadvantaged people and the handicapped. Because the credit is administered as part of the tax system, there are no standard activities and no evaluations of training or skills; each employer designs his or her own program. Follow-up is limited so it is hard to determine the extent to which participants are retained after the government subsidy has expired.

Employers also participate in the D.C. Private Industry Council (PIC) which is funded by JTPA and by other employer contributions. PIC employers help local groups identify training areas and provide input on industry standards which training programs should meet. In some instances employers or employer associations provided trainers, funds, work site laboratories and other ingredients to make programs succeed. These employers also helped PIC-funded programs with job placement. Such efforts were

---

[10] OJT activities usually roll over into TJTC. Because of late Congressional reauthorization of the enabling legislation and zero funding, the District reactivated its TJTC program in February, 1987. Between February and September, 1987, DOES certified 978 individuals and enrolled 569 employees.

the result of public system intervention. Out of the 112 programs interviewed for this study, just 10 were identified that served low-skilled, entry-level trainees and were wholly funded by private employers.

Most important, private-sector employers serve as sources of jobs.

Activities of other private sector groups

Private proprietary schools and other for-profit trainers also provide employment services under city contracts. Limited data were available from these trainers on the numbers of residents participating in programs that were not city-subsidized. Charitable organizations also provide low- or no-cost training. These include groups such as the American Red Cross, the Hannah Harrison Career School, Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries, and the Bethany Women's Center.

Labor union information was too limited to draw any conclusions about union training for low-skilled residents. A number of unions had entry requirements for their apprenticeship programs (such as minimum reading and math levels, having a high school diploma, being able to pass manual dexterity tests, or passing an oral interview). A few had low upper-age limits, which precluded entry primarily for women seeking nontraditional work, since such women often opt for nontraditional work after finding they cannot support themselves and their families in traditional entry-level jobs. Several of the unions said they primarily accepted either people who already met the requirements or who had participated in a publicly funded pre-apprenticeship program to improve their skills.

V. RESULTS OF AN INVENTORY OF ET SERVING DISTRICT RESIDENTS

Methodology and Summary

A list of ET programs available to low-income, low-skilled DC residents was compiled through interviews with local public agency representatives, funders, employer and business associations, and community organizations. We included only those programs that accepted people with less than a high school education and that did not charge tuition or, if they did charge, also provided waivers or financial assistance. We identified 171 programs that met our criteria.

Of the 171 programs identified, 57 were eliminated either because they no longer provided services or because they provided advanced training. Two declined to participate.[11]

A telephone survey was conducted of the remaining 112 programs. The 112 inventory programs collectively enrolled over 22,000 people and spent over $22 million to provide services. This figure represents nearly one-third of the total ET funds identified by the study.

We divided the inventory programs into the three ET sectors. Of the 112 programs, 64 were part of the official ET sector, 6 were part of the educational ET sector, and 37 were part of the special needs ET sector.[12] The rest of the analysis will refer to the programs both collectively (as inventory programs) and by the three sectors.

Agencies Providing ET

The programs were operated by five different kinds of agencies: nonprofit, community-based organizations; local public agencies; for-profit training organizations; private employers; and other agencies (primarily sheltered workshops for mentally or physically impaired people). Sixty-two programs were operated by nonprofit, community-based organizations, 18 by local

---

[11]Information about other ET programs operated by the public and private sectors augments the inventory to provide a more complete picture of ET activities available to District residents. These programs are discussed generally in this chapter and are described more specifically in Appendix B.

[12]We were able to categorize 107 of the 112 programs; five did not provide enough information to be placed in one of the sectors.

public agencies, 17 by for-profit trainers, 10 by employers, and 5 by other agencies.

Of the 64 programs in the official sector, over half were provided by nonprofit, community-based organizations. Included in this sector were six programs operated by the Public Schools, six by private employers, and 11 by for-profit trainers. All these programs were included in the official ET sector because they derived their funding, and thus their operating guidelines, from DOES, the only local public agency occupying the official ET sector. Of the six programs in the educational sector, four were run by for-profit trainers deriving funding and program guidance from the Public Schools. Finally, for the 37 programs in the special needs sector, 59 percent of the service providers were nonprofit, community-based organizations.

Participation in ET Programs in the District

Program participation is expressed in terms of enrollments and slots. Enrollments represent the actual number of people entering a program. Slots, on the other hand, represent planned or contracted-for spaces in a program. In many cases, the number of program enrollments exceeds the number of program slots. This can occur if enrollees drop out before completing a program and other enrollees fill their slots. Often programs over-enroll to insure that all available slots will be filled throughout the course of the program. (Some programs do not use slots as a measure of program capacity. For these programs, the number of enrollees is the same as the number of available slots.)

Of the 106 programs reporting a total enrollment of 22,000, those in the official sector (N=64)[13] enrolled 76 percent of all program participants, those in the educational sector (N=5) enrolled a little over 2 percent, and the special needs sector (N=37) enrolled the remaining 22 percent. The differences in the numbers of respondents in each sector, the great variation in program sizes in each sector, and the fact that many programs in the educational sector did not maintain the necessary information preclude all but some general observations.

---

[13]These figures (N=) which appear throughout this section of the chapter report the number of respondents to a particular question in the inventory.

By comparing the actual enrollments with available slots, we get only part of the information necessary to analyze the demand for ET services. Forty percent of the inventory programs had at least one unfilled slot; 30 percent had 10 or more unfilled slots. Without estimates of the total pool of potential trainees or information about reasons why qualified and available individuals fail to enroll, we cannot draw realistic conclusions about overall ET demand.

Characteristics of Program Participants

During the pre-test of the inventory instrument, we found that few program operators could provide specific demographic information about their trainees. Therefore, the instrument was revised to identify programs with special target populations. Such programs included those for ex-offenders, the handicapped, and people with English as a second language. The overwhelming majority of programs surveyed did not target their services to a particular population.

However, we are able to draw some inferences about the race, sex, and income of program participants from other sources. These consist of discussions with program operators and public agency administrators, the 1986 statistical portrait of employment and training (covering the official ET sector only) published in the July 1987 edition of Indices, and the occupational training areas represented in the inventory. This evidence suggests that the primary training population represented in the inventory was black women. We can also conclude that virtually all the inventory programs served primarily low-income people. Those programs that were not specifically means-tested served populations that are by definition low income, including welfare recipients, public housing residents, and the homeless.

Basic skills of program participants

Reported average basic reading and math levels for all program participants were low: under Grade 7. Most programs develop their curriculum at a specific grade level. If many participants do not meet the program's minimum basic skills requirements, a program might either redesign the curriculum or extend the program to allow slower students more time in which to master the program skills. Unfortunately, funding requirements

often preclude adequate program extensions. Sometimes, a program adds remediation or basic-skills tutoring to its curriculum to help students raise their skill levels.

Skill levels varied slightly among the sectors and between programs with remediation services and those without. For participants in the official ET sector, respondents reported an average reading level (N=43) of Grade 6.58 and an average math level (N=41) of Grade 6.44. The skills-level difference between participants in official-sector programs with remediation and those without was almost two grade levels. Programs providing remediation (N=23) reported an average reading level of Grade 5.74, while those not providing remediation (N=20) reported an average reading level of Grade 7.55. The average math level for programs providing remediation (N=23) was Grade 5.74; while those not providing remediation (N=18) reported an average level of Grade 7.33.

These differences were less pronounced in the other sectors. Programs in the educational sector (N=4) reported an average reading level of Grade 6.50 and an average math level of Grade 5.25. Those programs providing remediation (N=3) reported a reading level of Grade 6.33 and a math level of Grade 5.00. Those not providing remediation (N=1) reported a reading level of Grade 7.00 and a math level of Grade 6.00.

Programs in the special needs sector reported the smallest difference in basic skills levels between those programs providing remediation and those not providing it. Among the 27 respondents reporting reading grade levels, those who provided remediation (N=12) reported average reading at Grade 6.50 while those who did not provide remediation (N=15) reported average reading at Grade 6.33. Of the 26 programs reporting math levels, those that provided remediation (N=11) reported an average math level of Grade 6.27 while those that did not provide remediation (N=15) reported an identical average math level of Grade 6.27. The special needs sector includes a number of sheltered workshop programs, a fact that might explain the small differences in skills levels.

Types of ET Activities

Basic skills levels also vary depending on the type of ET activity a participant is involved in.

Programs in the inventory were identified as primarily engaged in one of 10 types of ET activities.

Over three-quarters of all inventory programs and two-thirds of program enrollees were engaged in training, job counseling, and OJT activities, with training most common.

Different activities dominated the three different sectors. In the official sector, those activities were OJT, training, and counseling. The educational sector engaged mostly in job-search assistance, while occupational training and job referral dominated the special needs sector.

Different activities were also associated with varying basic skills levels among program participants. Participants in work experience, basic education, ET program placement and referral, and job referral and placement averaged basic skills levels below Grade 6.00. The highest skills levels were found among participants in support services (Grade 9.00), counseling (Grade 7.20), and job-search assistance (Grade 7.00). On-the-job training, traditionally associated with higher skills levels, had participants who averaged Grade 6.90 in reading and math skills.

While most respondents stated that they did not target their programs to any particular group or population, some patterns did appear. OJT services seemed targeted to out-of-school youth, with basic education activities targeted to people with English as a second language. AFDC recipients, ex-offenders, and displaced workers were primary consumers of counseling services, and handicapped people seemed most likely to have program referral available. Training itself, however, did not appear to be highly targeted.

ET Occupational Areas

The inventory identified 10 broad occupational areas (plus an "other" category) for which programs most frequently provided ET services. Within the areas, specific job titles and occupations also were identified. Five occupations emerged as the dominant training areas for the inventory programs. These were clerk typist, other (lower level) clerical, kitchen helper, custodian, and housekeeper. Based on current data, these

occupations are the nongraduate occupations with the highest demand in the area (Bendick and Egan, 1988). The official ET sector provided training in 11 occupational areas, the special needs ET sector in 8 areas, and the educational ET sector in 4 areas. The average length of a program cycle was 20 weeks; however, program length varied greatly.

The Results of Participation in ET

Of the 17,200 enrollees in the inventory programs reporting training completion (N=29), 63 percent successfully completed their training. Once participants completed training, their employment prospects were fairly good. Of the programs reporting job placement (N=83), 86 percent of program completers were placed into jobs.[14] Between 70 and 100 percent of program completers from all ET activities and for all provider types were placed. Forty-six and seven-tenths percent of the enrollees both completed their training and got jobs.

Differences in completion and job placement emerged depending on program sector, the referral source of the program participant, and whether remediation was offered. The completion rate for official sector ET programs is 52 percent, for the educational sector it is 69 percent, and for the special needs sector it reaches 96 percent. Among completers, the official sector places 91 percent, the educational sector also places 91 percent, and the special needs sector places 69 percent.

These figures indicate a significant pattern. The official and educational sectors have relatively high dropout rates. However, if a participant completes his or her ET program in these two sectors, he or she is very likely to get a job.

On the other hand, nearly every ET special needs participant completes his or her program. However, graduates in this sector have a significantly smaller chance of getting a job.

This suggests that strategies for improving programs will be quite different from sector to sector.

---

[14]Because people who found a job prior to completing a program are included in the 63 percent "program completer" group, one cannot simply take the 86 percent placement rate and multiply it by the completer rate. The 46.7 percent enrolled/placed figure is correct.

Higher placement rates were also associated with program participants referred or recruited from DOES. Most program participants were recruited by the programs themselves through community outreach efforts. It should be noted that while many programs conduct their own recruitment efforts, often programs are required by their funding sources to channel recruits through the funding agency for assessment and processing before enrollment. The funding agency in turn "refers" the individual back to the program or to other available programs. This is particularly true for DOES.

Participants enrolled in remediation had lower placement rates than others. This is probably to be expected. Programs oriented to remediation or basic education are often not as focused on job placement as are OJT and other employment-oriented programs.

ET Costs

ET costs are often stated as cost per participant at program completion or placement. While these cost analyses might provide some benchmarks against which to measure program performance, they can often be misleading, particularly to the nonexpert. Such factors as the extent of support services, the length of training, the curricula and program design (particularly for programs requiring technical laboratories), the available post-training supports, and the specific needs of the service population all influence ET costs. In addition, such barriers to job placement as race, gender, age, and physical or mental condition might result in a significantly lower job-placement rate, thus increasing the cost per placement for a program serving a particular population.

Keeping in mind the limitations of using cost as a criterion for judging the effectiveness of ET programs, the inventory did identify some cost-related patterns. Wide differences in costs were associated with various training areas. Training costs per slot for the five areas with the highest number of enrollees averaged under $3,000 per slot (see Table 5-1). More expensive, with an average cost of $5,800-$7,100, were three occupational areas: nurse's aide, home health aide, and phlebotomy technician. Each had fewer than 500 enrollees. The highest average cost per slot ($9,600) was for welding and auto tune-up and repair (with a total of 1,215 enrollees).

Table 5-1
Cost per slot for the five most common job titles

Occupation	Slots	Average Cost per slot
Clerk typist	4,436	$3,016
Other clerical	3,261	4,030
Custodian	3,162	2,030
Kitchen helper	2,514	2,534
Housekeeper	1,546	1,576
Overall Average		$2,637

Cost differences also appeared among the ET sectors. The special needs ET sector spent over 50 percent more per enrollee and per slot than the official ET sector, while the educational ET sector spent the least. Given the special support services associated with the special needs sector, that sector's higher costs are not surprising.

Support Services

Clearly support services for ET participants are an important ingredient for program success. Along with transitional support, participants might need direct support during training. For example, given that in 1986 more than one-third of the District's working-aged poor women had children under six in their households (Grier and Grier, 1988) many women might be able to participate in ET only if child-care assistance is available. Accordingly, inventory programs were asked to report whether they provided any such assistance (a simple list of child-care providers, on-site child care, or something in between).

Thirty-six percent of the 11,755 slots offering job-specific training included some sort of child-care assistance. Availability in the six largest occupational categories ranged from a high of over 70 percent to zero (see Table 5-2). This inconsistency certainly affects the success of ET programs; we must develop support service standards that will work to help all ET participants.

Table 5-2
Training slots providing child-care assistance in the six largest occupational categories*

Occupation	Total slots	Child-care assistance provided	
		Number	Percent
Clerical	3829	1130	30%
Hospitality	2485	555	22
Mechanics	1076	395	37
Construction	829	260	31
Health care	806	585	73
Media	800	0	0

*For which child-care information was available.

VI. FINDINGS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

1. Significant resources are available to fund District ET services

The study found that nearly $68 million dollars was spent in 1986 on ET services for predominantly low-income, low-skilled DC residents. The bulk of these funds were provided, in roughly equal amounts, by the federal and the DC governments with modest additions from the private sector.

2. Coordinating federal and District programs would better serve underskilled, low-income people

Federal funds were frequently restricted to serve economically disadvantaged populations. Many programs funded with local money were less restricted. Although DC funds most often gave priority to and actually served many low-income people, these decisions were made at the program level.

However, in many interviews and group discussions, program operators using federal funds have stated that because of the high placement and low cost-per-participant rates attached to the funds, they are dissuaded from enrolling people who need extra help and support. In other words, although they are often restricted to low-income people, the federal funds paradoxically encourage program operators to select those participants with the best chances of success (perhaps even those who could find jobs on their own). Participants in the greatest need of assistance require an amount of time and a level of services that are not encouraged by federal regulations.

District funds are potentially more flexible. With inter-program planning and cooperation, District funds could be used to help low-skilled people improve their skills and become more attractive to operators of federally funded programs and programs requiring higher skills levels at entry. This could greatly expand the training available to underskilled potential workers.

District funds could also be used to fill some of the identified service gaps in both federal and District programs.

3. **Programs in the three sectors should be better coordinated**

Throughout the course of the study, program operators and agency representatives expressed a need for better information about other agencies' programs and other programs throughout the city. They said that such information would help them to plan what programs to offer, to identify programs for referral, and to identify recruitment sources. The study found a rich and diverse mix of programs, many apparently competing for the same target populations, and many unaware of what others were doing.

At the heart of any discussion of increased coordination is the evolution of ET into the official, educational, and special needs sectors. This evolution presents a rich opportunity for creative and innovative programming. At the same time it increases the need for better coordination among the sectors and makes the achievement of this coordination more difficult. The official sector and the educational sector have been part of the public's commitment to ET for a relatively long time. The special needs sector is comparatively new. Many special needs people experience multiple barriers to entering and successfully completing conventional ET programs. In addition to needing marketable skills, they often also need special environments, intensive counseling, and help in managing their personal lives. Some might need to be partially supported either financially or emotionally by the program throughout the entire course of their employment. The increased cost and greater time required to serve many of these people preclude their entry into more conventional ET programs. This is particularly the case with respect to mainstream, publicly funded programs that require a low cost per participant. Better coordination and joint venturing among the sectors would not only increase low-income people's access to ET services, but also would make available an array of flexible support services that could be tailored to meet the needs of specific client populations.

The issues of increased coordination and flexible programming were addressed by federal policymakers in designing JTPA. During the evolution of the legislation, policymakers realized that the broad dispersion of funds throughout the federal system would make attention to coordination a prerequisite for effective service delivery. Thus they created the Private Industry Councils, which can be likened to boards of directors serving a central coordinating function.

Locales, trying to balance more efficient use of funds with appropriate service delivery for diverse populations, have experimented with a number of models. One barrier to better coordination has been the different recordkeeping and program requirements attached to numerous federal and other funds used to provide ET or ET-related services. Some states and locales have established an umbrella agency to coordinate information exchange and planning. An umbrella agency facilitates discussions and interagency agreements to clarify roles, define accountability, and target service populations. Under this design, the ET programs themselves continue to operate independently but are better coordinated.

4. **The lack of consistent recordkeeping handicaps efforts to measure the extent and impact of ET and will make efforts to coordinate programs very difficult**

The study identified many ET activities operated by a variety of public and private agencies and funded by many different sources. Some agencies have an official mandate to provide ET services. Others provide them voluntarily, either to achieve some other human resource goal or because the agency feels its client population needs special services. The educational system offers yet a third group of programs. While these teach job-related skills, they do not usually place people in jobs. Although the purposes are different, the programs often overlap. With increased coordination, overlapping could be reduced and the array of services could be better focused. However, only those programs operated in the official sector have complete recordkeeping requirements. Programs in the special needs and educational sectors have few, if any, such requirements. As a result, there is no way to fully understand the nature and extent of current ET efforts in the District. Nor is an accurate assessment of long-term program effectiveness currently possible.

5. **Day-care support services are not offered by many programs**

Support services have been identified as one of the key ingredients enabling a participant to successfully enter, remain in, and complete an ET program. The inventory of 112 programs found that the majority of trainees were women, including AFDC recipients and public housing residents

(who are primarily single mothers). Yet only about 40 percent of the enrollees were provided with any day-care support services.

6. **A majority of program enrollees fail to complete programs and to enter jobs at program completion**

The study found that fewer than two-thirds (63 percent) of all participants who enrolled in the 112 inventory programs (where we have the most consistent data) completed them. Of program completers, about 14 percent failed to be placed in a job. In all, only about 47 percent of the participants who enrolled in these programs were able to successfully complete the program and find a job. Anecdotal information from agency spokespersons indicated that this finding was consistent with all but those long-term programs that fully screen program enrollees.

7. **Few program slots aggressively targeted adult male participants**

With the exception of programs serving offenders, the disabled, and dislocated workers, program operators reported as many as 80 to 90 percent of slots were filled by women. The city has stated that the majority of adults in the public programs are women with high school educations, many either welfare recipients or single mothers. Given the imbalance between women and men among the poor (Grier and Grier, 1988) this is not surprising. This preponderance of women in training is reflected in the occupations for which training is offered; the priority areas are those traditionally associated with women. (Those training areas also seem to have continued demand for workers; they therefore provide better opportunities for job placement.)

Some attempts are being made to increase male enrollment in locally funded programs. The District's Adults with Dependents program originally required that participants be responsible for the care and support of dependent children, a requirement most easily met by single mothers. In an effort to expand participation, in 1987 the city council eliminated the requirement, theoretically making it possible for more men to participate. It is conceivable that other, similar program-entry requirements, as well as gender stereotypes attached to particular occupations, might serve to limit men's use of other existing ET programs.

8. **Publicly-funded ET programs have difficulty filling available training slots**

The study found that among the 112 inventory programs, most of which received some public funds, about 40 percent had at least one unfilled training slot and 30 percent had more than 10 unfilled slots. Vendors and administrators of publicly funded programs agree that it is difficult to fill all the available slots. There are no definitive studies on reasons for the unfilled slots, though these could include unidentified barriers to program entry or a shrinking supply of potential enrollees. One explanation for these recruiting gaps might be the basic skills required of enrollees. Vendors report that they are receiving too few applicants who meet their programs' minimum basic skill requirements. Some vendors have added remediation classes to core program curricula for participants who need extra help; however, because most programs last less than 20 weeks, this has not been a satisfactory solution.

9. **A coordinated system is necessary to help low-wage, entry-level employees upgrade their skills**

Many entry-level jobs do not have a career ladder. The future for employees in these jobs is therefore limited. If we are to increase the number of people able to leave poverty through their earnings, we must enhance the ability of poor workers to acquire more valuable skills and hence better jobs. This can be done through upgrade programs.

Employers do not view upgrade training for employees in jobs without a career ladder as their responsibility; many employers feel unequipped to provide the training and support necessary for people with limited skills to significantly improve their marketability.

Thus, initiative in this area must come from the public sector or from private-sector foundations and employer groups. Upgrade training offers an important opportunity for reducing the population living in long-term poverty.

10. **Trainees might need help during the transition from training to employment**

Policymakers, program operators, and employers are all aware that a new employee incurs a number of additional expenses in his or her first weeks on the job. These include transportation costs, work clothing, and perhaps

day-care expenses. Yet the first paycheck from that job might not be received for some time, making the first weeks of employment very difficult. This important service gap deserves some attention if ET participants are to make successful transitions to their new jobs.

11. **Skills remediation needs close attention**

The study found that participants who are enrolled in some programs without remediation services do not have significantly better basic skills than do those participants enrolled in other programs with such services.

The study also found that the basic skills of most participants in the programs inventoried were quite low. National studies have shown that employers are placing increased importance on employees' reading, comprehension, computing, and problem-solving abilities. One cannot help being concerned about the prospects for long-term employment at above-poverty-level wages of trainees with low basic skills. A close look at the role that skills remediation should play in ET programs seems advisable.

12. **New initiatives**

Since 1986 the Department of Employment Services states it has undertaken initiatives to:

- extend training programs for 18 to 24 months to include remedial and job readiness services in addition to skills training;
- institute a safety net program to keep potential dropouts in training and to counsel those who have changed their occupational interest;
- institute evening training programs for those who work in low-skilled and low-paying jobs to upgrade skills;
- expand interagency agreements for child care, educational services, and health care to eliminate barriers to employment;
- conduct quarterly vendor round table discussions;
- institute a fully automated system to track participants for 26 weeks after placement.

APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGY

Goal of the Research

The research was designed to identify and gather specific program information on ET activities available to low-income District residents with limited employment qualifications in FY85 and FY86.

Criteria for Including Programs

For purposes of this study, ET activities were defined as those direct services that had job-holding as their primary goal. The following services were included within our definition of ET: on-the-job training, work experience, support services tied to job training or job-holding, basic education tied to job-holding, occupational training, job counseling, job search and job placement, referral and placement for training, and sheltered workshops. While programs that provided support services such as child care, medical care, or housing are critical to success in training and future job-holding, these programs were not included unless they had a stated job-search or placement component. Finally, programs that excluded or were not accessible to low-income, low-skilled residents were not included.

Identification of Programs

During the first two months of the study a series of fact-finding interviews was held with community-based organizations providing ET services, organizations providing other assistance to low-income residents, local government agencies responsible for overseeing employment-related activities, local foundations funding employment activities, the Greater Washington Board of Trade, and the District of Columbia Private Industry Council. The goals of the interviews were to

1) identify and secure any existing lists or inventories of ET activities and programs; and,
2) identify key sources of ET program information, particularly in the private sector.

Lists of ET programs were compiled from all these sources and from referral agencies identified in the interviews. The Community Foundation

of Greater Washington as well as the Washington Council on Agencies shared their membership lists to help identify new programs and sources of information.

Concurrently, a list of federal statutes (and the local implementing agencies) either mandating or allowing ET was identified. It was thought that interviewing the identified public agencies would provide a comprehensive list of public programs. However, the list of statutes that allow but do not mandate ET was so long and varied that this method was abandoned. Instead, the author used information about creative financing of ET that appeared in publications such as BNA Employment and Training Reporter, National Governor's Association Employment and Training Reports, and NAB Reports, to identify local public agencies. In addition, a list of ET grants was obtained from the District of Columbia Clearinghouse on Federal Grants.

To expand our list of private sector programs, we contacted, in addition to the Board of Trade and the Private Industry Council, employer and labor associations representing key employment areas for the city. These include the retail association, the association of hotels and restaurants, the local nurses' association, the office builders', grocers' and other associations. We also called the construction labor unions. Finally, we used the District Yellow Pages to contact the top three temporary, home and building maintenance, and health provider agencies, as well as a variety of computer, vocational, and technical schools.

We developed a final list of 171 programs that were potentially available to low-income residents with limited employment qualifications. Of these, 112 participated in the inventory. (In addition, we captured some program information from public agency interviews. These programs provided ET services and were available to our target population, but the programs did not maintain statistical information comparable to that maintained by the telephone inventory agencies. These separate programs are described in Appendix B.)

Controls for Double Counting

We developed rules for controlling double counting of funds and people. When two public agencies claimed ownership of the same program, we located the program participants once (assigning them, if possible, to the agency

actually providing the ET services); we counted all the funds reported from both agencies. However, in the case where an agency spokesperson or agency records showed a transfer, we counted the total funds only once and assigned the funds to the transferee agency (see adjusted totals in Table 4-4). Funds that were identified in publications and reports but that could not be documented by an agency spokesperson or agency records were excluded.

Conducting the Telephone Interviews

Survey forms, a talking sheet and instruction booklet, and a complete list of programs with a contact name and telephone number were assembled for the telephone interviews. Before receiving a telephone call, prospective respondents got a letter explaining the inventory and providing a simplified list of the information required in the interview. Those program managers who requested further information, or who wanted to complete the survey form and mail it, were accommodated. Telephone interviewers contacted the rest and scheduled 20-minute interview appointments, responding to questions as necessary. Over half of the scheduled appointments were broken or rescheduled. Programs were dropped from the study if after six attempts we were unable to establish contact with the identified spokesperson or if we had scheduled and failed to complete the interview six times. Generally, more than one interview was required to complete the survey form for a program. In an effort to increase the response rate, the District of Columbia DOES sent a letter and a copy of the survey to DOES-funded programs requesting their swift response. This, coupled with persistent telephone calls, resulted in nearly complete information on 112 ET programs serving predominantly low-income District residents.

APPENDIX B: SELECTED ET PROGRAMS IN THE DISTRICT WITH TARGET POPULATIONS

ET Services for Residents with Special Needs

Programs for low-income people target AFDC recipients or other such economically disadvantaged groups. Programs for people with special needs target older people, the mentally and physically handicapped, the homeless, and those for whom English is a second language. Many of these people cannot get paid work without intensive, long-term training and assistance, sometimes including some continuing public subsidy. Because of these special barriers, some of the ET programs targeted to these groups are not means-tested; we do not have information on the financial resources of participants in some programs. This section of the report reviews the major programs offered for residents with extra or special needs. We consider programs for the following: single parents, AFDC and Food Stamp recipients, public housing residents, low-income residents, prisoners and parolees, and mentally and physically handicapped residents.

Single Parents

Many programs target single parents; these groups include adults with dependents, AFDC recipients, and single mothers. The population consists almost entirely of women receiving some form of public assistance. The population overlaps with other special needs groups (such as public housing residents), and several agencies administer single-parent ET programs.

The District of Columbia Public Schools operates one such program: ASTEP (A Start Toward Employment Program). ASTEP was started in October 1985 by the Schools' Adult and Career Education Division; it is one of the few long-term programs identified during the study. The program is funded with $264,107 from Perkins. ASTEP provides services to low-income District residents who are single parents, displaced homemakers, or people seeking entry into nontraditional occupations. ASTEP provides the opportunity to train in any Career Center program and a host of support services and job-placement assistance. The Career Center programs range from 9 weeks to 2 years in length; ASTEP provides support and assistance for up to 2 years. ASTEP currently has 125 Career Center enrollees; these enrollees are included in the figures reported by the Career Centers.

AFDC and Food Stamp Recipients

In addition to the services provided to AFDC and Food Stamp recipients by DOES, CSS began its own in-house ET program in 1986 to provide job counseling, classroom training, and placement for AFDC mothers. The program was funded by the Income Maintenance Administration of CSS at $1 million, the program (JOBS) trained and placed over 150 women in jobs at the end of its first year. This program appears to be the beginning of an expanding ET role for CSS. A new federal law (the Food Service Act of 1985) requires that by April 1987 communities set into place training targeted for Food Stamp recipients. Also, the Department of Human Services (DHS) became the designated WIN agency for the District of Columbia as of July 1987 (DOES had previously served in this capacity) and has been awarded monies to run a WIN demonstration program. Finally, national and local legislation is being discussed that would increase training and work requirements for welfare recipients. These changes will increase CSS' involvement in ET. DHS has already increased its budget request for ET in FY88 to over $3 million, of which less than $1 million is from federal funds. This reflects a growing national trend to tie maintenance and support programs to employment activities.

Public Housing Residents

There are more than 60,000 residents in District public housing. (It is estimated that there are another 40,000 undocumented residents.) The majority of adult residents are women.

The Department of Housing has several programs that train and hire public housing residents. In FY86 the Department hired 54 residents as part of its Resident Management Program to work with the maintenance staff on 11 properties to improve interior and grounds maintenance. The Program offers training, on-the-job training, and the opportunity for permanent public-sector employment. It is being expanded in FY87 to 100 residents. The agency also provided temporary employment to 33 residents enrolled in the STEP program funded by the District of Columbia Department of Employment Services (see Prisoners and Parolees). In FY85, Housing used $406,000 in federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to directly place 528 District residents (no information was available as to what percent

were public housing residents) in temporary and part-time construction jobs. Because of the CDBG reporting system, data were not collected on the extent to which these temporary jobs resulted in permanent employment. The Department of Housing also pays for training and technical assistance for tenants to assume management responsibilities on their housing units. Such assistance at Kenilworth Courts/Parkside resulted in 23 property management positions being held by tenants. The Kenilworth/Parkside tenants have formed their own training agency, which sub-contracts with DOES, and have created jobs through the establishment of day-care and health-care centers, food cooperatives, and other service businesses.

The Department of Housing joins other city agencies (primarily DOES and the Public Schools) to design and deliver training specially targeted to public housing residents. These programs provide education and training in the skilled construction trades, building maintenance, and repair. The Department's funds go primarily for support services, needs-based payments, and building materials. Public housing properties are used as training sites. Because the Department does not itself provide the training services, these programs are discussed under the agency that sponsors the actual training.

The Department of Housing is also considering a broad-based economic development program for public housing residents. The proposed program, for which nearly $2 million has been set aside by the Department, would provide jobs, job training, and entrepreneurial opportunities (through business purchase assistance loans, etc.). The program would draw on the social service funds used by most city agencies to contract for services provided on a neighborhood level. The fate of the program is unclear in the face of the division of the Department into two separate agencies.

Low-income Residents

UPO works with the Department of Housing to train participants in its Pathways/Section 8 Project Self-Sufficiency. Under this two-year program the Department of Housing uses Section 8 certificates to get adequate housing for 100 WIN-registered program participants. UPO provides participants with job counseling, employment and life skills, training, and job placement. Under this program UPO also provides similar services to another 100

un- or under-employed residents who do not receive Section 8 housing certificates. In FY86 the total program cost $700,000; however, information was not available as to how much went directly to training.

Prisoners and Parolees

The Department of Corrections offers two programs to help move released prisoners into mainstream society: Second Chances Program, and Community Correctional Centers. DOES offers the STEP program.

Second Chances provides academic and vocational services to the inmate population. This population is overwhelmingly black and male, mostly between 21 and 35; nearly half (48 percent) were unemployed at the time they committed the crimes for which they have been incarcerated. Over 70 percent have failed to complete high school; they operate at between 5th and 6th grade reading and math levels. Second Chances provides basic assessment, remediation, G.E.D. preparation, counseling, and other academic courses. The program also offers vocational training in auto mechanics, auto body repair, barbering, bricklaying, and culinary arts. Between August 1984 and April 1986, 373 prisoners were placed into jobs from the program.

The Community Correctional Centers serve as transitions between an inmate's release from prison and his reintegration into the community. Corrections operates six such centers in the city. The Centers provide counseling and referral to career services offered by the Office of Educational Services or by other city agencies. Center participants must engage in job training, education, job-search, counseling, or other activities designed to enable them to live independently. On average, almost 60 percent of the residents successfully leave the Centers.[15] Data on employment and training program enrollment and completion for this group are included as part of the outcomes reported in each individual program.

STEP was initiated by Mayor Barry to increase deserving prisoners' access to parole by providing them with temporary employment (up to 12 weeks) in public agencies. Participants receive $3.35 per hour for their labor; during their temporary employment they are required to use community

---

[15]The highest success rate is among those convicted of crimes against persons (62.6 percent).

resources to secure permanent jobs. Of the more than 1,100 parolees released in 1986, 319 went through the STEP Program and 114 were placed into jobs. The total program cost $937,000 and was coordinated through DOES.

Mentally and Physically Handicapped Residents

Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) provides a variety of services for disabled District residents. Clients come to RSA to be evaluated for eligibility in programs, to be referred to training, and to be counselled on jobs and careers. RSA also conducts aggressive campaigns with employers, encouraging them to hire RSA clients. In FY85 RSA evaluated 13,000 City residents and provided services to 6,000.[16] Of the 6,000 served, 1,300 got jobs. Disaggregated data were not available to enable us to identify the costs, participants, and outcomes for ET activities.

The Developmental Disabilities Council (DD Council) is a federally funded program authorized under the Developmental Disability Act of 1984 to increase the employment of developmentally disabled people. In FY86, the DD Council received a federal appropriation of $300,000 and a matching in-kind local contribution of $150,000. Although the Council subcontracts to provide limited ET services to its target clients, it primarily focuses on getting employer job pledges and on coordinating with agency managers, client groups, and others to work on issues affecting the developmentally disabled.

---

[16]One difficulty in determining the level of ET services provided by RSA is the definition of "service". RSA uses a very broad definition which includes not only referrals to jobs or funding of training, but procuring medical attention or devices to enable clients to participate in work or training.

APPENDIX C: PROGRAM INVENTORY LIST

Organizations providing ET services that participated in the inventory

ACRT, Inc.
Action to Rehabilitate Community Housing (ARCH) Training Center, Inc.
Alliance Moving and Storage Corporation
American Red Cross - DC Chapter (2)*
Archdiocesan Manpower Corporation
Armstrong Adult Education Center
Automated Information Management
Bethany Women's Shelter
Boys and Girls Clubs of Greater Washington
Calvinade Beauty Academy
Capital Rehabilitation Consultants
CareerWorks, Inc.
Centennial One, Inc.
Center City Community Corporation
Center for Youth Development
Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind
Community Family Life Services/First Trinity Lutheran Church
Comptex
Cooperative Urban Ministry Center
Cox and Associates
Critique Career Management Service
CTA Management Group/Venture Concepts
Data Processing Institute
Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries
DC Association for Retarded Citizens (4)*
DC Concerned Citizens Caucus, Inc.
DC Office on Aging
DC Parent Child Center, Inc.
DC Public Library
DCPS Anacostia Clerical Training Program
DCPS Armstrong Adult Education Center (SMART)
DCPS Burdick Career Development Center
DCPS Career Center on the Mall
DCPS Franklin Adult Education Center
DCPS Gordon Adult and Career Education Center
DHS, IMA Commission on Social Services
Dickinson Business School
Ethiopian Community Center, Inc.

---

*Some organizations operated more than one qualifying program. The entire inventory included 94 organizations and 112 programs; each program was included separately. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of qualifying programs included in the inventory under the organization's name.

Finnie and Associates, Inc.
Florence Crittenton Services
Friendship House
Georgetown School of Science and Arts
Greater Washington Council of Churches (2)*
Hannah Harrison Career School
Health Management, Inc. (2)*
Homebuilders Institute
Homemaker Health Aide Service of the National Capital Area
Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)
Indo-Chinese Community Center
Institutional Housekeepers, Inc.
ITT Career Training Center
J & R Systems
J. W. Marriott Hotels, Inc.
Jubilee Jobs
Jubilee-America Trust
Kenilworth-Parkside Management Corp./Resident Training Institute
Labor Agency of DC/Arts DC
Labor Agency of Metropolitan Washington
Latin American Youth Center
Liberation of Ex-Offenders Thru Employment (LEEO)
Market Tire Education Services
Melwood Horticultural Training Center
Metro Study Foundation
National Association of the Deaf
National Institute of Phlebotomy
National Learning Center
Oak Hill Youth Center (2)*
Opportunities Industrialization Centers (3)*
Peoples Involvement Corporation
PLAN Learning Center
Preparatory School for Early Learning
Professional Human Development, Inc. (2)*
Pyramid Communications International
Quality Business System (2)*
Rehabilitation Opportunities, Inc.
Rehabilitation Services Administration
Sasha Bruce Youthworks, Inc.
Scanners International Beauty Academy
70001 Employment and Training Institute
Social Education Research and Development, Inc.
Southeast Vicariate Cluster, Inc.
Southwest Community Housing Association
Spanish Education Development Center
Strayer College
The Kaufmann Corporation
United Planning Organization (6)*
University of the District of Columbia
Washington Halfway Home for Women
Washington Urban League (2)*
Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc. (2)*
Woodrow Wilson International Center

Youth Service USA
Youthworks

LIST OF REFERENCES

Bendick, Marc, Jr. and Mary Lou Egan. 1988. JOBS: Employment Opportunities in the Washington Metropolitan Area for Persons with Limited Employment Qualifications. Washington, DC: Greater Washington Research Center.

Grier, Eunice S. and George Grier. 1988. PEOPLE: Low-Income Adults of Working Age in Washington, D.C. Washington, DC: Greater Washington Research Center.

GREATER WASHINGTON RESEARCH CENTER
1988 OFFICERS AND TRUSTEES

*Oliver T. Carr
Chairman
Oliver T. Carr Company

*Edmund B. Cronin, Jr.
Vice Chairman/Budget & Finance
Smithy-Braedon Company

*Gerald A. Polansky
Vice Chairman/Membership & Marketing
Touche Ross & Co.

*Karen Hastie Williams
Vice Chairman/Program & Scope
Crowell & Moring

*John Morton, III
Treasurer
Maryland National Bank

*Lisle C. Carter
Secretary
United Way of America

*Atlee E. Shidler
President

*Philip M. Dearborn
Vice President

Duane B. Adams
The Acacia Group

Gregory T. Allen
AT&T

*Minerva W. Andrews
McGuire, Woods, Battle & Boothe

*Mac Asbill, Jr.
Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan

Roger R. Blunt
Essex Construction Corp.

Ann Brown

Ronald H. Brown
Patton, Boggs & Blow

Vincent C. Burke, Jr.
Steptoe & Johnson

*Daniel J. Callahan, III
American Security Bank

A. George Cook
Colonial Parking

Marshall B. Coyne
The Madison Hotel

*Kent Cushenberry
IBM Corporation

*Paul Dragoumis
PEPCO

*Henry A. Dudley
The Riggs National Bank

Sheldon W. Fantle
Dart Drug Stores, Inc.

*Samuel L. Foggie
United National Bank of Washington

F. David Fowler
Peat, Marwick, Main & Co.

*Thomas M. Gibbons
C&P Telephone Company

Charles W. Gilchrist

*Robert Gladstone
Quadrangle Development Corp.

*Aaron Goldman

Michael B. Goldstein
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson

Leonard J. Grant
National Geographic Society

William Greenhalgh
Georgetown University Law Center

William C. Harris
Crestar Bank

John T. Hazel, Jr.
Hazel/Peterson Companies

John W. Hechinger, Jr.
Hechinger Company

L. Ralph Hicks, Jr.
Sovran Bank/Maryland

*Luther H. Hodges, Jr.
National Bank of Washington

Edwin K. Hoffman
Woodward & Lothrop

*Philip R. Hogue
Realty Decisions Group

Judith R. Hope
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker

Frank Kent
Kent Enterprises, Inc.

LaSalle D. Leffall, Jr.
Howard University Hospital

*Terry L. Lengfelder
Arthur Andersen & Company

*R. Robert Linowes
Linowes & Blocher

Elizabeth St. J. Loker
The Washington Post

*Louise Lynch
Courtesy Associates

J. Robert MacNaughton

Patrick J. Maher
Washington Gas Light Co.

*G.J. Manderfield
M. Field Enterprises, Inc.

John J. Mason

John P. McDaniel
Medlantic Healthcare Group

*David E. McGiffert
Covington & Burling

Ruby Burrows McZier
National Business Services Enterprises, Inc.

William E. Miller

Jeff Mitchell
American Transit Advertising, Inc.

*A.G. Newmyer III
Newmyer Associates, Inc.

Thomas F. Nicholson
West*Group

*Thomas J. Owen
Perpetual American Bank

Sue Burnett Panzer

Whayne S. Quin
Wilkes, Artis, Hedrick & Lane

*Paul E. Reichardt

Lois D. Rice
Control Data Corporation

Dale P. Riordan
Federal National Mortgage Association

*Carl W. Ruppert
Price Waterhouse & Company

Charles B. Ruttenberg
Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn

Ronald C. Scheeler
Ernst & Whinney

*Ivan Selin
American Management Systems

*John F. Silton
Coopers & Lybrand

Jean Head Sisco
Sisco Associates

Edith Barksdale Sloan

Joshua I. Smith
Maxima Corporation

Guy T. Steuart II
Steuart Investment Company

William G. Thomas
Hazel, Thomas, Fiske, Beckhorne & Hanes

*John M. Toups
Planning Research Corporation

Mallory Walker
Walker & Dunlop, Inc.

Julia M. Walsh
Julia M. Walsh & Sons, Inc.

Rev. John P. Whalen
Consortium of Universities

*Betti Whaley
Washington Urban League

Eddie N. Williams
Joint Center for Political Studies

Walker A. Williams
Walker A. Williams & Co.

Jan Yocum
Rosemont Center

Leonard A. Zax
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson

*Executive Committee

GREATER WASHINGTON RESEARCH CENTER
MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

The Acacia Group
John Akridge Management
American Security Bank
The American University
Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn
Arnold & Porter
Arthur Andersen & Company
Arthur Young & Company
Atlantic Research Corp.
AT&T
The Barlow Corporation
Barnes, Morris & Pardoe
BDM International, Inc.
Beers & Cutler
Norman Bernstein Management, Inc.
Blake Construction Co., Inc.
Blue Cross & Blue Shield of the National Capital Area
Cabot, Cabot & Forbes
Edward R. Carr & Associates
Oliver T. Carr Company
Chadick & Kimball
Chevy Chase Chevyland
Citicorp Savings
The Clark Construction Group
C&P Telephone Company
Colonial Parking
Columbia First Federal Savings & Loan Association
Coopers & Lybrand
Courtesy Associates
Covington & Burling
Crestar Bank
Crowell & Moring
CSX Transportation
Cultural Alliance of Greater Washington
David, Hagner & Harvey
Deloitte, Haskins & Sells
Dickstein, Shapiro & Morin
Dominion Bank of Washington
John F. Donohoe & Sons
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson
Equitable Real Estate Investment Management
Ernst & Whinney
Essex Construction Corp.
Exxon Corporation
Federal City Council
Federal National Mortgage Association
First American Bank, NA
First American Bank of Maryland
First National Bank of Maryland
Folger Nolan Fleming Douglas, Inc.
Ford Motor Company
Fort Lincoln Realty, Inc.
Carl M. Freeman Associates, Inc.
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson
Fulbright & Jaworski
GA/Partners, Inc.
George Mason University
The George Washington University
Georgetown University
Giant Food Inc.
Gilbane Building Company
Government Employees Insurance Co.
Grant Thornton
Greater Washington Board of Trade
Greater Washington Society of Association Executives
Guttenberg & Company
Hammer, Siler, George Associates, Inc.
Hazel, Thomas, Fiske, Beckhorn & Hanes
Hazel/Peterson Companies
Hechinger Company
The Hecht Company
Heidrick and Struggles, Inc.
Gerald D. Hines Interests
Hogan & Hartson
Horning Bros.
Housing Data Reports
Howard University
Hughes Hubbard & Reed
E.F. Hutton & Company Inc.
Hyatt Regency Washington
IBM Corporation
International Developers, Inc.
Jaffe Associates, Inc.
JBG Associates
Johnston, Lemon & Co., Inc.
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
Journal Newspapers

S. Kann Sons Company
Keyes, Condon & Florance
The Kiplinger Letters
LaSalle Partners
Lee Development Group
Linowes & Blocher
The Henry A. Long Company
The Madison Hotel
Madison National Bank
Marriott Corporation
Maryland National Bank
McGuire, Woods, Battle & Boothe
Medlantic Healthcare Group
Melrod, Redman & Gartlan
Miller & Chevalier, Chartered
The Milton Company
Montgomery General Hospital
Mortgage Bankers Association of America
Morton's Stores
Mulligan/Griffin & Associates, Inc.
Mutual of Omaha
National Bank of Washington
National Business Services Enterprises, Inc.
National Geographic Society
Newmyer Associates, Inc.
Office of Social Development, Archdiocese of Washington
Omni Construction, Inc.
Paul Foldes & Associates
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
Peat, Marwick, Main & Company
Peoples Drug Stores, Inc.
Perpetual American Bank
Planning Research Corporation
Potomac Asset Management
Potomac Electric Power Company
Potomac Group, Inc.
Powell, Goldstein, Frazer & Murphy
Price Waterhouse & Company
Quadrangle Development Corp.
Quality International, Inc.
Realty Decisions Group
Reasoner, Davis & Vinson
Regardie's
Richmarr Construction Company
Riggs National Bank
Rockville Crushed Stone, Inc.
Rogers & Wells
Rogovin, Huge & Lenzner
Rose Associates, Inc.
RTKL Associates, Inc.
Sears Roebuck & Company
Seidman & Seidman/BDO
Settles Associates, Inc.
SGY Development Ltd. Partnership
Shannon & Luchs Company
The Sigal Zuckerman Company
Signet Bank-Metro Washington Group
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Charles E. Smith Companies
Smithy-Braedon Company
Sovran Bank/Maryland
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey
Stanley Martin Companies, Inc.
Steuart Investment Company
Julien J. Studley, Inc.
Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan
The Taubman Company
Touche Ross & Co.
Union Labor Life Insurance Co.
United Jewish Appeal Federation of Greater Washington
United National Bank of Washington
USAir, Inc.
USLICO Corporation
US Sprint
Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard McPherson & Hand
Virginia Power Company
Walker & Dunlop, Inc.
Julia M. Walsh & Sons, Inc.
Washington Business Journal
Washington Gas Light Company
The Washington Post Company
Washington Times
Washington Urban League
The Washingtonian
Weaver Brothers
West*Group
WETA
Wilkes, Artis, Hedrick & Lane
Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering
WJLA-TV
WMAL Radio
Woodward & Lothrop
WUSA-TV
YMCA of Metropolitan Washington

Greater Washington Research Center

1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 403
Washington, D.C. 20036-2076
(202) 387-0900

BEST COPY AVAILABLE